

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7

8 SANDRA L. KINNEY, *et al.*,

No. C-12-4477 EMC

9 Plaintiffs,

**RELATED TO**

10 v.

No. C-12-4478 EMC

11 BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, *et*  
12 *al.*,

No. C-12-4615 EMC

No. C-12-4616 EMC

No. C-12-4617 EMC

No. C-12-4619 EMC

No. C-12-4633 EMC

13 Defendants.

No. C-12-4641 EMC

No. C-12-4642 EMC

No. C-12-4803 EMC

14 AND ALL RELATED ACTIONS.  
15

**ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL  
BRIEFING**

16  
17  
18  
19 As the parties have informed the Court, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation  
20 (“MDL”) recently denied without prejudice transfer of the above-referenced cases. The Court thus  
21 has pending before it Plaintiffs’ motions to remand.


22 The Court directs the Plaintiffs to file supplemental briefing. Defendants have taken the  
23 position that a distributor cannot issue additional warnings beyond those contained in the FDA-  
24 approved labeling or, under federal law, they will be subject to civil and/or criminal penalties for  
25 misbranding. In their supplemental brief, Plaintiffs should address why a distributor would not be  
26 liable for misbranding under federal law if it were to issue such additional warnings beyond those  
27 contained in the FDA-approved labeling. The Court notes that it previously asked for supplemental  
28 briefing on this very issue in the *Caouette* case, *see Caouette v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, No. C-12-

1 1814 EMC (Docket No. 41) (Order at 2) (asking “what should McKesson have done in the instant  
2 cases to satisfy [the] duty [to warn]” and “how are those actions not inconsistent with or prohibited  
3 by federal law”); however, the *Caouette* Plaintiffs did not directly respond, focusing instead on the  
4 argument that *Mensing* applies only in the generic drug context. *See id.* (Docket No. 44) (Pls.’  
5 Supp. Br. at 8). Plaintiffs in the cases at bar have similarly argued that *Mensing* is restricted to the  
6 generic drug context. *See, e.g., Kinney v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, No. 12-4477 EMC (Docket No.  
7 18) (Reply at 10). Plaintiffs have yet to address the question (assuming the logic of *Mensing*’s  
8 impossibility analysis applies here) why it is not impossible for a distributor to provide additional  
9 warnings (as Plaintiffs contend is required by California law) and not contravene federal law.

10 Although Plaintiffs are represented by different counsel, the Court shall require Plaintiffs to  
11 coordinate and file a single supplemental brief. The supplemental brief shall be filed by February  
12 26, 2013.

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15  
16 Dated: February 19, 2013

17  
18   
19 EDWARD M. CHEN  
20 United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28